

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 10, 11, 17, 19, 20, 26, and 31 to 46 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 11 and 20 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for her careful consideration of this application, and for withdrawing the prior rejection over Fiasconaro and Pedersen.

In this Office Action, the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,600,488 (Yoshida). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 defines a method of trimming a parametric surface. Prior to rendering the parametric surface, the method includes producing a trimming texture. The trimming texture comprises a texture map image representation of a trimming curve for the parametric surface. The trimming curve defines trimmed and untrimmed portions. The untrimmed portion comprises opaque pixels and the trimmed portion comprises transparent pixels. During rendering of the parametric surface, the method includes obtaining a list of polygons that define the parametric surface, and drawing the polygons to generate the parametric surface. Drawing the polygons includes applying the trimming texture to the polygons. The trimming texture is applied by texture mapping the trimming texture onto the polygons to produce the trimmed and untrimmed portions.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1. In this regard, Yoshida describes a trimming process that involves drawing a trimming curve on a 2D texture, and then cutting-away polygons that are inside or outside of the trimming curve

(see, e.g., column 46, lines 17 to 20 and 44 to 51 of Yoshida). As correctly noted in the Office Action, Yoshida describes textures. Yoshida even describes a process that it calls “texture-based trimming” (see, e.g., column 45, lines 52 et seq.). However, that process involves cutting-away polygons from an area that is to be transparent or adding (or replacing) texture on polygons that presumably are not to be transparent (see, e.g., column 45, lines 60 to 63). It does not involve texture maps. In fact, Yoshida states:

The advantage of configuring the trimming shape with 2D polygons (an [*sic, and*] not with a texture pattern) is that it is then easy to deform shapes interactively and in real time. [col. 45, lines 60 to 64]

This statement, which teaches away from the use of texture patterns in a trimming context, appears to teach away from the use of the texture map trimming method of claim 1.

Thus, as understood by Applicants, Yoshida does not disclose or suggest, prior to rendering a parametric surface, producing a trimming texture comprising a texture map image representation of a trimming curve for the parametric surface, and producing trimmed and untrimmed portions of a parametric surface using that texture map.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the art. Amended independent claim 11 is an article of manufacture claim that roughly corresponds to claim 1; and amended independent claim 20 is an apparatus claim that roughly corresponds to claim 1. These claims are also believed to be patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicants : Dean P. Macri, et al.
Serial No. : 09/539,343
Filed : March 31, 2000
Page : 11 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-154001
Intel Docket No.: P7988

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7896.

Please apply any fees or credits due in this case, which are not already covered by check, to Deposit Account 06-1050 referencing Attorney Docket No. 10559-154001.

Applicants : Dean P. Macri, et al.
Serial No. : 09/539,343
Filed : March 31, 2000
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-154001
Intel Docket No.: P7988

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 24, 2006



Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

ATTORNEYS FOR INTEL
Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21363615.doc